U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [**X**] Title I [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal: Mrs. Ann Sugibayashi

Official School Name: Royal School

School Mailing Address:
1519 Queen Emma Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-2002

County: Honolulu State School Code Number*: 147

Telephone: (808) 587-4510 Fax: (808) 587-4518

Web site/URL: http://www.royal.k12.hi.us/ E-mail: Ann_Sugibayashi@notes.k12.hi.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Ms. Kathryn Matayoshi

District Name: Honolulu Tel: (808) 586-3310

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Garrett Toguchi

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.

7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)

39	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
9	Middle/Junior high schools
6	High schools
1	K-12 schools
55	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9876

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

[X] Urban or large central city
[ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
[ ] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural area
[ ] Rural

4. 6 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	4	6	10	**6**			0
K	35	29	64	**7**			0
1	38	31	69	**8**			0
2	31	21	52	**9**			0
3	29	28	57	**10**			0
4	26	20	46	**11**			0
5	30	24	54	**12**			0
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					352

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
43 %	Asian
2 %	Black or African American
3 %	Hispanic or Latino
22 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
5 %	White
25 %	Two or more races
100 %	**Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 14 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	25
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	23
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	48
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	354
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.136
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	13.559

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 28 %

Total number limited English proficient 97

Number of languages represented: 14

Specify languages:

Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Chuukese, Marshallese, Samoan, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Arab, Thai, Palauan, Spanish, Pohnapeian

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 62 %

Total number students who qualify: 220

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 13 %

Total Number of Students Served: 46

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

8	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	2	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	19	Specific Learning Disability
1	Emotional Disturbance	0	Speech or Language Impairment
0	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	0	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	15	Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	21	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	0	0
Paraprofessionals	8	8
Support staff	5	0
Total number	35	8

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 **17 :1**

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	85%	90%	86%	89%	93%
Teacher turnover rate	0%	19%	15%	16%	12%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

11.Â This is not a true reflection of the actual student-classroom teacher ratio as the total number of classroom teachers includes 6 special education teachers who preside over classrooms with much lower pupil count, thus lowering the student:teacher ratio.

13. Re Student dropout rate applies to middle/high schools. Â Royal School is an elementary school.

13.Â Daily teacher attendance for school years 2004-2008 were taken on the following dates: Â Sept.1, 2004, Sept. 1, 2005, Sept. 1, 2006, Sept. 4, 2007, and Sept. 2, 2008.

13. Re: Teacher turnover - If a teacher did not come back to the school for the new school year, their separation was attributed to the prior school year (i.e. Teacher worked 04-05 SY, but transferred to another school for the 05-06 SY, separation attributed to the 04-05 SY). The numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of separations/number of filled positions for that school year.

2008/2009 = 0.00 (0/24); 2007/2008 = 0.19 (5/26); 2006/2007 = 0.15 (4/27); 2005/2006 = 0.16 (4/25), and 2004/2005 = 0.12 (3/26).

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size		
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
Total		%

PART III - SUMMARY

Royal School enjoys a rich historic past with the distinction of being founded by King Kamehameha III in 1839 to educate the children of Hawaiian royalty. Originally known as The Chiefs' Children's School and situated on the grounds of Iolani Palace, the school serves the sixteen Ali'i (royal) children who were taught by missionary couple, Amos and Juliette Cooke. Subsequently, the school's name was changed to The Royal School in 1846 and relocated to its present location. We are the oldest public school on the island of Oahu, situated on 3 acres in downtown Honolulu.

King Kamehameha III envisioned that the education of the future monarchs of the Hawaiian kingdom would prepare them to rule with wisdom in a changing, complex world. 170 years later, our Vision "TOGETHER: SMARTER, BETTER, HIGHER" incorporates his wish to provide a learning environment where students learn and grow to be contributors to the community in a world that is more complex and ever-changing.

Today, Royal School is part of a community of government and commercial buildings, medical facilities and retail businesses. Our families reflect many ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds, predominately low income, in a neighborhood that consists of older single family homes, condominiums, and apartment dwellings, including low-income rentals, transitional housing, and State housing units. In addition, we have been designated the elementary school for children who reside in the area's homeless shelter. We recognize the unique and wide ranging spectrum of needs in our diverse population and strive to build relationships that honor the cultural differences and provide for the educational needs of our students. We hold "Parent Community Networking Center" (PCNC)-sponsored coffee hours, annual reading and math nights, parent orientations, and encourage parent participation through volunteerism. We arrange for interpreters at parent meetings and school gatherings to facilitate parent understanding and collaboration that contributes to student achievement.

Student learning is reflected in the Hawaii State Assessment data over the past 7 years. We received Hawaii's Blue Ribbon recognition in 2003 and have earned Hawaii Distinguished School awards showing a consistent trend of increasing reading and math scores. We are a school that has met adequate yearly progress, thus earning and retaining the NCLB In Good Standing, Unconditional status. In 2007, Royal School received an award and recognition from the Harold K.L. Castle Foundation for achieving a gain of at least 20 percentage points in the number of students who scored proficient or above on their 3rd grade reading scores. Subsequently, a Promising Practices Project case study was conducted on Royal School in 2008 to analyze and identify practices that contributed to our reading gains with the intent of sharing this information with other Hawaii schools.

Student achievement in a caring environment is a priority at Royal School. The teaching staff provides a safe, warm, and culturally sensitive classroom environment which emphasizes the school behavioral expectations as specified by the three B's: Be Respectful, Be Safe, and Be Responsible. Student progress is closely monitored and faculty and support staff work closely to provide supports and intervention to students who are experiencing difficulties. Provision for our gifted/talented students is made through employment of First Lego League robotics projects, enabling them to research real life problems and create new innovative solutions. We actively teach students to demonstrate the General Learner Outcomes and celebrate through our Super Citizen awards. We strive to provide a positive and safe school environment that fosters student growth and learning.

Through partnerships with community and educational organizations such as The Queen's Medical Center, Sunrise Rotary Group, National Guard, and Punahou School we have worked to make our Vision "TOGETHER: SMARTER, BETTER, HIGHER" a reality.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

The State of Hawaii developed the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards III Assessment to measure student proficiency on Hawaii's Reading and Math Content Standards. These rigorous assessments are held in the spring of each year and are administered to students in grades 3, 4, and 5. Proficiency level scores are given - "Well-Below", "Approaches", "Meets", and "Exceeds".

The benchmarks for Adequate Yearly Progress and reporting purposes for No Child Left Behind requirements were determined by the State of Hawaii Department of Education. Benchmarks for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years were set at 44% for reading and 28% for math. Benchmarks increased in the 2007-2008 school year to 58% in reading and 46% in math.

From 2004-2005 to 2008-2009, there has been an upward trend in Royal School students' scores in each of the tested grade levels (gr. 3, 4, 5) and significant improvement in both reading and math proficiency.

In 2008-2009, 69% of grade 3 students were proficient in reading, up 21% over those that were proficient in 2004-2005. Gain was also seen in grade 4 students proficient in reading. In 2008-2009, 62% of grade 4 students were proficient in reading, an increase of 10% from 2005-2006 (the first year that fourth graders were tested on the Hawaii State Assessment.) In 2008-2009, 76% of grade 5 students were proficient in reading, an increase of 12% over 2004-2005.

Even greater gains were seen in math. In 2008-2009, 47% of grade 3 students were proficient in math, a 26% increase over those that were proficient in 2004-2005. Gain was also seen in grade 4 students proficient in math. In 2008-2009, 56% of grade 4 students were proficient in math, up 21% from 2005-2006 (the first year that fourth graders were tested on the Hawaii State Assessment.) In 2008-2009, 70% of grade 5 students were proficient in math, an increase of 34% from 2004-2005. Although there have been slight dips between some of the years, scores have generally increased.

When examined longitudinally, the trend of improvement has continued. 60% of grade 3 students in 2006-2007 were proficient in reading. The following year, proficiency in grade 4 increased by 6% and then again by 10% in grade 5. Similar increases were seen in math proficiency across 3 years. 57% of grade 3 students in 2006-2007 were proficient in math, increasing to 68% when those students were tested in grade 4, and to 70% when they were tested in grade 5.

Our school has shown steady improvement in scores, a testament to teachers' commitment to making needed changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices across all grade levels and to our students' efforts to be more responsible for their learning. Scores and Trend reports may be found at doe.k12.hi.us.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Over the years, we have learned the importance of using results of assessments and data from various sources to make decisions on curriculum and instruction and to form a picture of our school. We look at demographic data and perceptual data as well as more formal sources of data from State and school assessments, both for the current year and over time. We collect data on many different levels - classroom, school, State-- and these data are analyzed, discussed, and used for instructional planning within and across grade levels.

Our school conducts a comprehensive needs assessment annually to prepare our Academic Plan. This assessment is conducted over a period of 3 months with faculty during faculty meetings, with grade level chairpersons during a special GLC meeting, and with the School Community Council during regularly scheduled meetings. Strengths, challenges, root cause(s) of the challenges and positive effects of practices are elicited through our examination of data.

We have used our assessment results to revise our curriculum maps, to align our assessments more closely to the benchmarks and to our State Assessment, and also to identify students who need intervention. During many of our 2-hour faculty meetings, we use our assessment results as a focus of professional conversations in which we examine instructional coherence, consistency and continuity between grade levels. We have found that there is true power in looking at everyone's data in order to build a strong foundation for our students and to ensure that instruction makes sense. We have come a long way in looking at our data with more objectivity and with the aim of improving student achievement -- something that we know is possible when we work together to build a system where every child can succeed.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Student performance information is communicated through various means to our parents, students, and community. Our monthly newsletter is the primary vehicle through which we share important information. This includes celebratory messages as we post summaries of our students' performance data on the Hawaii State Assessment. Our first Open House of the school year is also used as a venue to share and explain Hawaii State Assessment results followed by individual classroom visitations where teachers explain expectations for students to achieve proficiency on the benchmarks.

Hawaii State Assessment results are also explained to separate stakeholder groups: the School Community Council, PCNC Ohana coffee hour parent meetings, and the PTA. Parent workshops are also conducted to share HSA results. Interpreters are recruited to help explain the information presented, suggest strategies for home use, and to answer parent questions for the purpose of increased parent understanding of their children's performance on assessments. Parents are provided with State generated reports and explanations of their child's HSA results.

Student performance information is not limited to HSA results. Our standards-based report cards also include results of Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) reading assessment on students in grades K-3. These data include the benchmarks that are expected for each grade level and allows parents to share data with their children to make comparisons to the benchmarks. Parents are able to note their children's strengths and needs and support interventions based on those needs. Parent/Teacher conferences are also held after the first quarter to discuss student progress. Student progress is also communicated on a daily basis through individual student planners.

Hawaii State Assessment scores, quarterly assessment scores, and progress reports for Royal School may be found on the Hawaii Department of Education website.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Royal School has always been open to collaborating and sharing ideas, curriculum, and practices with fellow educators. We have received and honored requests from other school principals to open our classrooms for their teachers to visit and observe our classroom instruction, reading and math programs. During these visits, we field questions and comments which, in turn, allow us to reflect on how we can continue to improve our instruction. We are also open to new ideas and consider sharing a two-way street.

Most notably, a Promising Practices Project was conducted at Royal School in 2008 as a result of our significant reading gains. This case study covered different aspects of school practices and contained an

analysis to identify successful components that lead to the significant increase in our students' reading scores. These results were shared with other Hawaii schools.

Our sharing extends beyond our campus as well. Royal School teachers meet with other teachers during workshops or other professional development venues. Visitations, walkthroughs, and conferences with other Hawaii Department of Education administrators knowledgeable about Royal School's demographics and challenges also facilitates the sharing of our school's curriculum, specifically our reading and math programs and their implementation.

We continue to welcome others who wish to observe successful teaching practices and the implementation (with fidelity) of our school wide reading and math programs.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

Although many of the children at Royal School are from "disadvantaged" backgrounds, Royal School strives to help our students become children of advantage/promise through rigorous, relevant curriculum and high expectations and instruction that is adapted to their needs, that delivers experiences that help to build vocabulary and background knowledge. We endeavor to develop the skills and attitudes necessary to be successful throughout life. We are cognizant of the need to expose and foster Quadrant D critical thinking skills in our students.

Royal School has a standards-based curriculum that is based on the content and performance standards set by the State of Hawaii. Curricular decisions are based on data and involve examination of the standards and use of best practices to determine what is necessary to meet those standards. We have focused especially on building thinking skills, problem-solving skills and positive learning attitudes in reading, math, and writing -- the literacy building blocks upon which all content rests.

Our reading curriculum (Reading Master & Open Court) is research-based and provides systematic, explicit scaffolding of skills and use of the model-lead-practice-test strategy. Homogeneous grouping is used primarily in grades K-3 to allow students' needs to be met through targeted instruction. Students in grades 4 and 5 who need more support in meeting the standards are placed in smaller groups, allowing for flexibility in meeting student needs. Performance is assessed regularly, using in-program assessment materials as well as teacher-made assessments that are aligned to standards and that are written in the format of the State test.

Our math curriculum (Investigations) is also research-based and focuses on helping students to make sense of math and think mathematically. The processes of problem-solving, reasoning, strategy-building and communication in math are major drivers of the math curriculum. Students spend time exploring problems in depth, develop and practice mathematical concepts in different contexts, and using different strategies to solve problems. The math curriculum is organized into units, lasting 2-5.5 weeks that help develop interconnectedness between different math concepts. In addition to the core program, teachers use supplemental materials to develop concepts, skills, and the processes of math.

Instruction in science focuses on inquiry-based lessons utilizing hands-on FOSS science kits and informational resources, including but not limited to a Harcourt science text. Students are encouraged to learn and demonstrate the scientific processes, integrating math, reading, and writing skills.

Our students are provided with instruction in social studies standards-based content subject areas such as U.S. History, Hawaiian Studies, World History, and Geography. Current events and its impact on the world in which we live as well as the impact that students have on their community are explored. Students participate in activities that have environmental impact such as the worm bin project and the storm water/drainage monitoring required under the Clean Water Act.

The SPARKS Health and Physical Education curriculum is carried out with the assistance of two part-time teachers as part of a 3 year Carol White grant that focuses on health and wellness of all students. Students participate in physical activities and educational sessions on health, safety, and nutrition. They collaborate with our cafeteria manager to plan a healthy menu which is then served on designated days.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading**:
(This question is for elementary schools only)

Royal School's reading curriculum is structured, provides explicit instruction, and is based on research on effective practices. Both the Reading Mastery and Open Court programs are used. The Reading Mastery program is used for grades K-2 and for below grade level groups in grades 3-5. This program provides well-ordered reading instruction in phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, fluency, and comprehension -- the important "learning to read" skills. Students are grouped homogeneously in relatively small groups and their reading needs are addressed through instruction presented in well-sequenced tasks, guided and consistent practice, and frequent review and assessment. Teachers supplement the core program with higher level comprehension questions and open-ended reading response questions. The greatest effect of this program has been increased student confidence in their ability to read text. Students no longer "look at books" but actually feel that they can read the words, using their newly acquired decoding skills.

The Open Court program is used with students in grades 3-5. Open Court also provides direct, explicit instruction although the focus is on "reading to learn" skills and strategies. Teacher modeling and think alouds are incorporated into the program, as are opportunities for practice of various comprehension strategies. Writing in response to reading is incorporated into lessons daily. Our supplemental programs for interventions for at-risk readers take the form of either placement at an appropriate Reading Mastery level or Open Court at a lower grade level. Placement in a below grade level reading book takes some of the decoding pressure off the students and allows their thinking and comprehension to be developed. One of the surprising effects of using this program is that students are more comfortable in making connections to previous knowledge, to other stories, and to one's own experience.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

At Royal School, we focus on basic literacy areas and insure that our other core content areas are integrated with reading, writing, and math. Our science curriculum integrates reading and writing skills, utilized when addressing content and generalizations. Standards based lessons in physical science, biological science, and Earth-space science align with the State benchmarks. Additionally, our science curriculum allows students to develop critical thinking skills such as problem-solving, generalizing and generating hypotheses, and scientific attitudes such as curiosity, wonderment and flexibility. We utilize the FOSS series, which provides hands-on experiences and investigations in which students are expected to use their thinking skills and inquiring attitudes to make sense of the world around them. Content reading is provided through informational resources, including, but not limited to a Harcourt science text and internet resources.

Communication, collaboration, problem-solving, and technology skills are applied when sharing newly learned science content with others. General Learner Outcomes are incorporated in learning activities and units. Different grouping scenarios are used to foster cooperation and help our second-language students access information and develop scientific skills. Older students participate in recycing projects, such as a recently awarded grant project allowing students to recycle food waste via worm bins and tunnel, that benefit the environment and integrate social studies through environmental stewardship.

Problem-solving, critical thinking, oral and written communication throughout Royal School help to prepare our students for our changing world, TOGETHER: SMARTER, BETTER, HIGHER.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Students at Royal School are a diverse group of learners, coming from various ethnic and language backgrounds, bringing different experiences and expectations with them. Teachers at Royal School use research-based instructional strategies gained from professional development and readings to deliver high quality instruction. Although these strategies are effective for many students, it is also important to provide

differentiation. By pre-testing basic concepts using performance assessment methods teachers compact curriculum by assessing student knowledge and providing alternative activities for students who have mastered said concepts.

One of the most useful strategies has been the provision of in-school, afterschool, and intersession tutorial sessions for identified students. This gives students more opportunity to see good modeling and to practice skills. These tutorial groups are generally flexible, where a student may be moved to a reading group that will challenge him/her at an appropriate level.

We also use our part-time teachers to provide assistance to individual or small groups of students in the classroom setting. They provide additional information regarding students with needs or misconceptions and also deliver targeted help. Use of cooperative grouping is also a way to help English Language Learners develop communication and vocabulary skills in the classroom setting. Double-dose instruction delivered by highly qualified teachers is another means of accommodating diversity. Teachers also spend time with students during recess or afterschool to further explain and practice skills and concepts.

5. **Professional Development:**

Professional development activities are planned and conducted in alignment with identified areas of need in our school's Academic Plan. The selection of our new math and science programs resulted in scheduled training for teachers to implement the programs consistently and effectively. Our Academic Plan's professional development decisions are based on examination of student data to determine and prioritize areas of need for professional development that will positively impact on student learning. Professional development is not limited to program in services but also include those that hone the craft of teaching and expand on teachers' understanding of current research, incorporating rigor and relevance in their lessons.

We are also part of the McKinley Complex of schools with similar demographics, performance data, and challenges. Our professional development needs are often similar to those of the Complex and professional development for the entire Complex takes place on our common Complex planning/collaboration day. Our Complex Area has piloted and implemented an electronic standards-based report card and developed standards-based rubrics with the assistance of Dr. Robert Marzano.

Additionally, we pursue professional development, aligned with our Complex and State, to incorporate features of a 21st Century model school and attend sessions offered by Bill Daggett and other presenters whenever possible. We participated in AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) training to prepare our students with skills that will enable them to succeed in secondary as well as post secondary schools.

It is our overarching goal to support our students by providing them with the skills necessary for success.

6. **School Leadership:**

Royal School's school leadership team consists of the principal, Literacy/Title I Coach, Math/Gifted & Talented Coach, and grade level chairpersons. Many of the decisions that govern operational aspects of the school are made by the principal. These decisions are usually ones that impact the smooth running of the school and situations that involve health and safety. The principal keeps abreast of current policies, rules, laws, and regulations and apprises the faculty and staff of changes and the ramifications of the changes.

Decisions regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment and the school's budget are shared through articulation and planning and are collaborative in nature. The Academic Plan, which governs the school's goals, activities, and professional development for one school year, is developed collaboratively by the leadership team and is based on student achievement data, parent/community input, and other pertinent

information. Allocation of monies to implement the Academic Plan is determined by the principal as the schools other operational and personnel expenses must be met. The Academic and Financial Plans are then shared with the School Community Council who are provided the opportunity to have input and with the general school community. The School Community Council is comprised of the principal, parent, community, faculty, and staff representatives.

School level decisions are based upon mutual respect between the principal and faculty. There is an explicit understanding among all stakeholders that decisions are made with the students' best interests in mind and that these decisions are focused on student achievement and well-being. The principal and leadership team monitor the implementation of the Academic Plan initiatives to insure that we are accomplishing what we set out to do and insure accountability.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	47	46	57	50	21
% Advanced	27	30	30	7	3
Number of students tested	45	63	63	56	62
Percent of total students tested	100	98	97	100	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	2	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	2	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45	41	47	49	15
% Advanced	23	27	16	11	2
Number of students tested	31	41	38	35	41
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		0			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		10			
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		17	39	8	0
% Advanced		8	0	0	0
Number of students tested		12	18	12	10
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	48	48	55	49	21
% Advanced	26	30	27	9	2
Number of students tested	42	56	56	47	57

Notes:
RE: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed Above = Asian/Pacific Islanders

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	56	60	64	48
% Advanced	13	8	14	2	0
Number of students tested	45	63	63	56	62
Percent of total students tested	100	98	97	100	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	2	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	2	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	49	53	60	49
% Advanced	13	7	5	3	0
Number of students tested	31	41	38	35	41
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		0			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		10			
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		17	39	17	30
% Advanced		8	11	0	0
Number of students tested		12	18	12	10
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	57	59	62	47
% Advanced	12	7	13	2	0
Number of students tested	42	56	56	47	57

Notes:
RE: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed = Asian/Pacific Islander

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56	68	58	35	40
% Advanced	32	27	38	0	4
Number of students tested	50	59	53	63	48
Percent of total students tested	98	98	100	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	47	60	54	24	37
% Advanced	21	17	34	0	5
Number of students tested	34	35	35	38	41
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		55	38	0	
% Advanced		18	23	0	
Number of students tested		11	13	13	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	65	60	32	40
% Advanced	31	27	38	0	3
Number of students tested	45	49	42	59	40

Notes:
RE: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed Above = Asian/Pacific Islanders

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	66	64	52	63
% Advanced	16	8	8	0	6
Number of students tested	50	59	53	63	48
Percent of total students tested	98	98	100	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56	54	63	37	63
% Advanced	9	0	3	0	7
Number of students tested	34	35	35	38	41
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		55	46	0	
% Advanced		0	0	0	
Number of students tested		11	13	13	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	65	64	51	60
% Advanced	18	10	10	0	8
Number of students tested	45	49	42	59	40

Notes:
Re: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed Above = Asian/Pacific Islander

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	68	25	37	36
% Advanced	43	41	13	0	2
Number of students tested	54	56	63	52	66
Percent of total students tested	95	98	98	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	62	13	33	27
% Advanced	33	38	8	0	0
Number of students tested	33	39	38	39	44
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		20	10	8
% Advanced	17		20	0	0
Number of students tested	12		10	10	13
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	73	21	33	36
% Advanced	35	44	14	0	2
Number of students tested	46	45	57	46	61

Notes:
RE: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed Above = Asian/Pacific Islanders

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Hawaii State Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: Yearly Publisher: Hawaii Dept. of Education

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	68	43	50	64
% Advanced	24	7	0	2	3
Number of students tested	54	56	63	52	66
Percent of total students tested	95	98	98	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	2	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	62	37	51	52
% Advanced	18	5	0	3	5
Number of students tested	33	39	38	39	44
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		0	20	8
% Advanced	8		0	0	0
Number of students tested	12		10	10	13
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	73	39	48	62
% Advanced	17	9	0	2	3
Number of students tested	46	45	57	46	61

Notes:
RE: #6 Largest Other Subgroup Not Listed Above = Asian/Pacific Islander